



Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

Orel, Alex, Campbell, Marilyn A., Wozencroft, Kelly, Leong, Eliza Weiqin,
& Kimpton, Melanie
(2015)
Exploring students' coping strategy intentions for cyberbullying.
Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30.

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/87457/>

© © The Author(s) 2015

Notice: *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

<http://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515586363>

Exploring University Student's Coping Strategy Intentions for Cyberbullying

Alexandra Orel
Marilyn Campbell
Kelly Wozencroft
Eliza Leong
Melanie Kimpton

Queensland University of Technology

Corresponding Author

Dr Marilyn Campbell MAPS
Professor
School of Learning and Professional Studies, Queensland University of Technology
Kelvin Grove QLD 4059
Australia
Tel: 61 7 31 38 38 06
Fax: 61 7 31 38 82 65
ma.campbell@qut.edu.au

Keywords: Emerging adults, university students, coping strategies, cyberbullying

Abstract

Most of the published research on cyberbullying has been conducted with children and adolescents, so little is known about cyberbullying in other populations. This study examined cyberbullying within an emerging adult population in a university setting ($N = 282$), and explored what coping strategies these individuals intended to use in response to future cyberbullying incidents. Blocking of the sender of the bullying message was found to be the most frequent intention to cope with cyberbullying among these emerging adults. It was also found that both gender and victimisation status (i.e., whether the emerging adult had, in the preceding twelve months, been a victim of cyberbullying) influenced coping strategy intentions. The implications for practice and future research are discussed.

Keywords: emerging adults, university students, coping strategies, cyberbullying

Throughout an individual's life a variety of stressful events will be encountered, and cyberbullying is one such stressful event. Defined as a form of traditional bullying, it is an aggressive, intentional behaviour carried out by a more powerful group or individual using electronic forms of contact repeatedly against a less powerful victim who cannot easily defend him or herself (Smith et al., 2008). The way an individual copes with cyberbullying has important implications for their psychosocial functioning (Bauman, Toomey, & Walker, 2013). Coping is theorised to be a response mechanism whereby stressful situations can either be amplified or abated (Aldwin, 2007). Cyberbullying victimisation can result in deleterious consequences for the individual's well-being, which can include low self-esteem, low academic performance, depression and suicide (Hinduja, & Patchin, 2007; Hinduja & Patchin, 2013; Mitchell, Ybarra, & Finkelhor, 2007). Importantly, the consequences of cyberbullying have been shown to be even more deleterious than traditional bullying (Campbell, Spears, Slee, Butler, & Kift, 2012).

While most cyberbullying research has been conducted with school students, studies also show that cyberbullying impacts up to 22% of university students (Macdonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2010; Walker, Rajan Sockman & Koehn, 2011; Wensley & Campbell, 2012). Despite these findings no research has specifically investigated how university students intend to cope with cyberbullying. Exploring intentions is important as this information can be used to make speculations about how all university students-not just cybervictims-are likely to cope in the event of future victimisation. As the coping response impacts psychosocial functioning (Machmutow, Perren, Sticca, & Alasker, 2012), the way a university student copes with cybervictimisation therefore may be a key factor that either helps bolster optimal well-being or leads to adverse outcomes. Given that cybervictimisation typically impairs psychosocial functioning, more studies are required to investigate how university students cope with this stressful situation.

Coping Frameworks

Coping models indicate that in response to stressful events individuals can use a variety of coping strategies. Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) seminal work proposed that coping is an appraisal based transactional process that results in the use of either problem focused (e.g., problem solving and help-seeking) or emotion focused (e.g., avoiding and ignoring) coping. This model has been widely used within the stress and coping literature to examine how children, adolescents and adults respond to a range of events (Compas, Connor-Smith, Saltzman, Thomsen, & Wadsworth, 2001). Using this model as a theoretical framework Frydenberg and colleagues (Frydenberg 2008; Frydenberg & Lewis, 1993; 2000) proposed that adolescent coping could be classified as productive (e.g., problem solving and investing in friends), reference to others (e.g., seeking social support and professional help), and non-productive (e.g., ignoring the problem and wishful thinking) (Frydenberg 2008; Frydenberg & Lewis, 1993; 2000). Other models have focused on understanding how coping manifests differently over the lifespan. Drawing upon developmental studies some researchers have conceptualised coping as *regulation in response to stress* (e.g., Connor-Smith et al., 2001; Skinner & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2007). These theorists suggest that coping changes throughout the lifespan and is heavily influenced by developmental characteristics of the individual (Skinner & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2007). Collectively, these coping models reinforce that coping is a transactional process that is influenced by internal (individual) and external (environmental) characteristics.

Cyberbullying Trends

Successfully coping with cyberbullying involves using strategies that are associated with more positive outcomes, ones that aim to reduce the current bullying and prevent future victimisation (Perren et al., 2012; Vollink, Bolman, Dehue, & Jacobs, 2013). On the other hand, unsuccessful coping is associated with strategies that inadequately address the bullying

and result in negative outcomes. Investigating how university students cope is important for two reasons. First, there is scant research in this area and second, school-based cyberbullying literature highlights a link between victimisation and unsuccessful coping (Sticca & Perren, 2013). Studies from traditional bullying literature have found that the coping strategy of help-seeking of adolescents (e.g., from friends and adults) may be able to help reduce the impact of bullying on psychosocial outcomes. For example, Davidson and Demaray's (2007) study found evidence to indicate that social support can help protect against internalising (e.g., anxious-depressive) symptomology for victims of bullying. In the cyberbullying literature however, it appears that many victims do not always use strategies such as help-seeking (Cassidy, Faucher, & Jackson, 2013). Some studies have found between 50-90% of school students do not use any help-seeking strategies for cyberbullying, instead they cope by doing nothing, ignoring, avoiding or retaliating (Juvonen & Gross, 2008; Slonje & Smith, 2008; Tokunaga, 2010). These findings reinforce Smith and Shu's (2000) assertion that many victims of bullying behaviours are suffering in silence.

When school students do use productive type strategies, they are more likely to seek help from friends before family members and teachers. For example, Cassidy, Jackson, and Brown (2009) reported that adolescent students preferred, in the event of cybervictimisation, to cope by firstly telling a friend, followed by a parent and then school personnel. There is one study which has examined the types of coping strategies used by cybervictims from a university setting. Schenk and Fremouw (2012) found that American cybervictims aged 18-24-years-old, typically coped by telling someone, avoiding friends, and seeking revenge. These findings indicate that while university cybervictims do use help-seeking strategies, they seem to use more strategies that are likely to be less effective for ameliorating the cyberbullying (e.g., seeking revenge and avoiding social situations).

Victimisation Status (i.e. victim or non-victim), Gender and Coping Strategies

Help-seeking is one coping strategy that is promoted by schools as a tool to combat bullying behaviours (Richard, Schneider & Mallet, 2012). However, it appears that factors such as victimisation status and gender can influence an individual's use of this strategy. For example, Smith et al., (2008) identified that secondary school students who had not been cyberbullied recommended telling someone as one of the best strategies for cyberbullying. Closer analysis however, showed that many cybervictims did not tell anyone. Other research has shown that adolescent cybervictims are considerably less likely to cope by seeking help from teachers and friends when compared to traditional victims (Vollink et al., 2013). Cybervictims may be less inclined to use these types of coping strategies, due to concerns regarding strategy effectiveness and concerns about a non-supportive school climate (Cassidy, Brown, & Jackson, 2012; Hoff & Mitchell, 2009; Parris, Varjas, Meyers & Cutts, 2012). No evidence is available to indicate whether university students would seek help from university personnel, or if victimisation status influences coping strategy intentions for future cyberbullying.

University based research on gender and coping strategies for cyberbullying is also scant. However, school based literature has shown that boys and girls differ in their use of certain coping strategies. For example, boys are less likely to use help-seeking strategies as a way of coping with cyberbullying compared to girls (e.g., Li, 2006; Dooley, Grading, Strohmeier, Cross, & Spiel, 2010). Retaliation however, appears to be more widely used among boys compared to girls (Machmutow et al., 2012). Examining how male and female university students intend to cope is likely to be beneficial for increasing our understanding of gender specific coping strategies for cyberbullying.

Coping with Bullying in a Digital Landscape: Technological Coping

A growing trend suggests that in response to cyberbullying individuals are also using online strategies as primary forms of coping (e.g., block and delete functions). Cybervictims aged 10-25-years-old reported that the most helpful offline strategy involves telling a friend and the most helpful online strategy is blocking (e.g., Price & Dalgliesh, 2010). Other findings showed cybervictims cope by deleting, ignoring cyberbullying messages or staying away from where the cyberbullying has occurred (Dehue, Bolman, & Vollink, 2008; Tokunaga, 2010). There is some contention within the literature regarding whether or not these online strategies are effective for the amelioration of cyberbullying (Cassidy et al., 2013). The combined results however, demonstrate online strategies are popular and that cybervictims perceive that 'blocking' is a helpful coping strategy.

The cyberbullying coping field is an emerging one. Despite research showing that cyberbullying occurs within university settings, no research has examined how university students intend to cope with this behaviour, and whether victimisation status and gender influences coping strategy use. Such knowledge will not only be beneficial for expanding the cyberbullying coping field, but also will be useful for students and universities, especially regarding support options and anti-bullying policies.

This study is an exploratory examination of the types of coping strategies university students intend to use for future events of cyberbullying. The study also explored the influences of gender and victimisation status on coping strategy intentions.

Method

Participants

A total of 282 students from a south eastern Queensland university, 204 females (72.3 %) and 78 males (27.7 %), with a mean age of 19 ($M = 19.73$, $SD = 2.14$) participated in this

study. The criteria for participation required the individual to be a current university student aged between 18 to 25-years-old. Participants were recruited through the first year psychology research pool and through emails sent out by a Course Coordinator from the School of Psychology and Counselling at the university to the larger student population. First year psychology students received course credit for their participation, and all other participants were entered in a prize draw for a \$100 VISA gift card.

Measures

Coping Questionnaire

An 11-item questionnaire was specifically developed to explore what types of coping strategies university students intended to use in response to any future cyberbullying. While there are many coping scales available no coping scale has yet been developed for cyberbullying and the university student population. Therefore items used in this study's questionnaire were adapted from a review of the coping with bullying (i.e., traditional and cyber) literature (e.g., Aricak et al., 2008; Perren et al., 2012; Parris et al., 2012; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012; Tenenbaum, Varjas, Meyer, & Parris, 2011; Tokunaga, 2010). Participants were asked to report the likelihood of using coping strategies on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from very unlikely, unlikely, likely to very likely, if they were cyberbullied in the future. Each item received a score ranging from 1-4 respectively.. The mean score for each item was used to examine the likelihood of participants using that coping item. An item that received a score of 4 was used to indicate that a specific strategy would be more likely to be used compared to another one that received a score of 1. Examples of the questions included: "I would block the cyberbully"; "I would seek help from my friends"; and "I would ask the cyberbully to stop". *Cyberbullying question*

As with other sensitive topics such as adult intimate partner violence (Coker, Smith, McKeown, & King, 2000) and cyberbullying in adolescents (Campbell et al., 2012) cyberbullying victimization was assessed using a single item.. The following definition of cyberbullying was provided to participants: “Cyberbullying is bullying using technology. It is when one person or a group of people repeatedly try to embarrass another person, using their computer or mobile phone, to use power over them. With cyberbullying, the person bullying usually has some advantage over the person targeted, and it is done on purpose to hurt them, not like an accident or when friends tease each other.”

The cyberbully victim question asked “How frequently you have been cyberbullied by someone who you suspect was from your university during the past 12 months? This includes emails, chat rooms, instant messaging, websites, or text messaging.” Participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from never, once or twice, monthly, weekly, or daily. Participants who reported at least one experience of cyberbullying were classed as victims. For this item victims received a score of 1 and non-victims received a scored a 0. Participants were also asked to indicate their gender (male or female) and age (18-25-years-old).

Procedure

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee. The online questionnaire was hosted by the university’s survey software on a secure server. The data for this study was collected as part of a larger research study using a 126-item questionnaire examining various aspects of life at university. An online information sheet was provided to participants prior to the commencement of the study. Submission of the questionnaire indicated consent. Participation was voluntary and responses were anonymous. All data collection took place between July and November 2013.

Analysis

Descriptive analyses were firstly conducted to examine the mean scores of participants who endorsed each of the 11 coping strategies. This analysis was used to indicate the popularity of a strategy. Mann-Whitney U tests were then used to examine if there were differences between males and females, and also between cyberbullying victims and non-victims for the 11 items measuring coping strategies. The distribution of responses of each of the eleven coping styles was skewed and hence non-parametric MannWhitney's were used. While means and standard deviations are provided by way of description, medians and IQRs and mean ranks are also reported for each coping strategy as is customary with non-parametric between group tests. The alpha level was set at 0.05 and SPSS for Windows version 22 was used for all the analyses.

Results

Descriptive Analysis of Coping Strategy Intentions

Descriptive analysis was conducted to examine the coping strategies university students would most likely use in response to future incidences of cyberbullying. Table 1 presents the descriptive data for the eleven coping strategies.

INSERT TABLE I ABOUT HERE

Victimisation Status (i.e., victim and non-victim) and Coping Strategy Intentions

Approximately 16% of the sample reported an incident of cyberbullying within the preceding 12 months. A Mann-Whitney U test indicated three significant differences among the 11 coping strategies between the victims and the non-victims. Table 2 shows the significant differences in coping strategies intentions between victims and non-victims.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Gender and Coping Strategy Intentions

A Mann-Whitney U test revealed a number of significant differences for gender and coping strategy intentions. Table 3 shows the coping items that yielded significant results for gender.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Discussion

The current study revealed that university students intend to cope with cyberbullying in a number of different ways. The three most popular strategies (i.e., blocking, staying away from where the cyberbullying was taking place, and seeking help from friends) indicated that university students would use a combination of online and offline strategies to cope with cyberbullying. This pattern of results could indicate that university students may desire to engage in coping strategies that are perceived to be autonomous and problem focused (Zimmer-Gembeck & Skinner, 2011).

We found that most university students would intend to cope by using a blocking strategy. Although results from this and other studies (e.g., Price & Dalgliesh, 2010) indicate blocking is widely as endorsed coping strategy, efficacy issues have been raised within the literature (Cassidy et al., 2013). From one aspect blocking may be considered a productive problem solving strategy as the bullying can be immediately stopped (Tokunaga, 2010). An alternative view suggests that blocking could be an unproductive strategy as cybervictimisation can continue through other mechanisms such as emails or text messages (Cassidy et al., 2012; Dehue et al., 2008). It is posited that university students view this strategy as a convenient first line of defence for cybervictimisation, and could use it while contemplating other strategies.

Examination of the victimisation results revealed important findings. These results indicated victims, as opposed to non-victims, are less likely to use the blocking function to cope with future cyberbullying events. This finding is inconsistent with some school-based research, which showed that these cybervictims commonly use, and regard blocking as an effective coping strategy (e.g., Aricak et al., 2008; Price & Dalgliesh, 2010). University-based cybervictims may perceive blocking to be an ineffective strategy, as they recognise or have experienced that victimisation can continue through other mechanisms (e.g., private text messages or social media post). This finding is interesting and indicates that university-based cybervictims may be less inclined to use strategies that are perceived to be ineffective than has been shown previously.

The other important finding was that cybervictims were more likely to seek help from a university lecturer compared to non-victims. School-based cybervictims are reportedly reluctant to seek help from teachers, due to fears associated with loss of peer relationships, concerns about restriction to their devices, or that teachers are unable to provide adequate support (Cassidy et al., 2013; Hoff & Mitchell, 2009). The finding that cybervictims would seek help from a university lecturer indicates that university students may not have these concerns, and this could be associated with developmental maturity (Zimmer-Gembeck & Skinner, 2011). These results may have also occurred as many of the participants were psychology students. These individuals may believe that within university settings reports of cybervictimisation would be managed more confidentially compared to other students. This speculation together with the findings, appears to reinforce the notion that coping is an appraisal based process, and that appraisals become more sophisticated with age (Frydenberg & Lewis, 1993; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Skinner & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2007).

School-based cyberbullying research demonstrates that cybervictims are more likely to cope by help-seeking from teachers, when they are perceived to be supportive,

knowledgeable about cyberbullying, and can offer adequate assistance (Cassidy et al., 2012; Perren et al., 2012). Therefore, university cybervictims may have an expectation that university lecturers will have the necessary knowledge and skills to resolve cyberbullying situations, particularly if cyberbullying is occurring on a university platform (e.g., online class discussion board). University cybervictims may also feel that they have greater potential to work with a lecturer to manage the cyberbullying in a co-operative manner. This may explain why cybervictims are more likely to seek help from a lecturer as opposed to using blocking as a coping strategy.

The finding that cybervictims would be more likely to cope by getting others to cyberbully the bully compared to non-victims is interesting. This result could indicate that when placed in a stressful situation such as cyberbullying, victims may feel that they have a greater chance at ameliorating the bullying with the help of others. This appears to be somewhat similar to Schneck and Fremouw's (2012) study which found university cybervictims can use retaliation as a coping strategy. Together, these findings may suggest that university students feel that retaliation based strategies are effective ways to cope with cyberbullying. To explore this supposition future research should investigate the rationale for coping strategy use.

Gender findings indicate that female university students showed a greater tendency to use help-seeking strategies compared to males, which is consistent with school based research (e.g., Li, 2006). Females may intend to cope by using help-seeking to a greater extent than males as they believe these are more effective coping strategies for reducing or stopping the cyberbullying. The finding that males would be more likely to cope by getting others to cyberbully the bully, could indicate that males as opposed to females believe that support from their friends-using forms of retaliation-would be an effective coping strategy. The other gender finding showed that females would be more likely to use blocking as a

coping strategy compared to males. This result may demonstrate that females aim to use coping strategies that directly restrict contact with the cyberbully. Comparing the gender findings, it would seem that males prefer to cope by engaging in retaliating type behaviours, while females prefer to engage in help-seeking and contact restricting coping strategies (e.g., help-seeking and blocking). These findings however, must be interpreted with caution as the sample for this study was imbalanced with many more females than males.

The results from this study provide preliminary evidence to indicate that online coping strategies are popular among university students and that victimisation status and gender appears to influence coping intentions. Importantly, this is the first known study to show that university cybervictims, and female students in general, intend to use a number of types of help-seeking strategies in response to cyberbullying.

Limitations

As it was expected that there would be a low percentage of cyberbullying victims in the sample, all university students were surveyed about their intentions. Although examining intentions can yield important insight into the types of coping strategies likely to be used, it is acknowledged however, that intentions are not failsafe predictors of actual behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). So while these results indicate the types of strategies likely to be used in response to cyberbullying these findings may not reflect actual coping behaviours. Therefore, the current study's results can only be used to speculate about the coping strategies likely to be used in response to future cyberbullying, as other factors such as changes in the university setting, for example, may influence actual coping behaviours (Cassidy et al., 2013; Richard et al., 2012). Noteworthy, these coping results may also have occurred as participants were required to report on their coping intentions using a forced choice questionnaire and could not rank their coping preferences. The findings could be an artefact of the questionnaire rather than actual coping intentions, thus further research using different measures is required.

This study did not examine the type and strength of cyberbullying (e.g., one defamatory picture posted on a forum or multiple text messages to personal phone). Consequently, it cannot be determined whether these issues mediated or moderated the coping results.

Future Research and Implications

Investigating lecturers' perspectives about their roles, responsibilities and competency for managing reports of cybervictimisation may help to establish better methods to reduce cyberbullying within university settings. This research seems crucial as school-based research shows that teachers reportedly have poor response resolution skills for cyberbullying situations (Cassidy et al., 2012). Future research in this area may help inform the development of more specialised coping strategy campaigns for the student population both within universities and other tertiary education contexts.

This study has revealed that university students have experienced cybervictimisation, yet to date support for these individuals seems to be largely overlooked by universities. In recent years greater emphasis has been placed on school-based prevention and intervention campaigns (Paul, Smith, & Blumberg, 2012). However, this emphasis does not appear to be mirrored in university settings and highlights a major disservice to students. Given the deleterious consequences of cyberbullying, increased knowledge is required in order to help tertiary institutions position more effectively against cyberbullying. A stronger stance is important to ensure a safe and supportive learning environment is provided to all students.

Conclusion

The current study was an exploratory investigation of the coping strategies likely to be used by university students in response to cyberbullying. Findings indicate that these students may intend to use both online and offline coping strategies, and that gender and previous experiences of cybervictimisation may result in the use of different coping

strategies. Combining these results with previous research supports the view that coping with cyberbullying is a complex phenomenon, one likely to be influenced by victimisation status and gender. This study offers new insights into how university students intend on coping with cyberbullying. Such information broadens the field and is likely to provide practical information for universities and other tertiary institutions.

References

- Aldwin, C.M. (2007). *Stress, coping, and development: An integrative perspective* (2nd ed.). New York, NY. Guildford Press.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020T
- Aricak, T., Siyahhan, S., Uzunhasanoglu, A., Saribeyoglu, S., Ciplak, S., Yilmaz, N., & Memmedov, C. (2008). Cyberbullying among Turkish youth. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 11, 253-261. doi:10.1089/cpb.2007.0016.
- Bauman, S., Toomey, R.B., & Walker, J.L. (2013). Associations among bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide in high school students. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36, 341-350. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.12.001
- Campbell, M., Spears, B., Slee, P., Butler, D., & Kift, S. (2012). Victims' perceptions of traditional and cyberbullying, and the psychosocial correlates of their victimisation. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 17, 389-401. doi:10.1080/13632752.2012.704316
- Cassidy, W., Jackson, M., & Brown, K. N. (2009). Sticks and stones can break my bones, but how can pixels hurt me? Students' experiences with cyberbullying. *School Psychology International*, 30, 383-402. doi:10.1177/0143034309106948
- Cassidy, W., Brown, K.N., & Jackson, M. (2012). 'Under the radar': Educators and cyberbullying in schools. *School Psychology International*, 33, 520-532. doi: 10.1177/0143034312445245
- Cassidy, W., Faucher, C., & Jackson, M. (2013). Cyberbullying among youth: A comprehensive review of current international research and its implications and

applications to policy and practice. *School Psychology International*, 34, 575-612.

doi:10.1177/0143034313479697

Coker, A., Smith, P., McKeown, R., & King, M. (2000). Frequency and correlates of intimate partner violence by type: Physical, sexual, and psychological battering. *American Journal of Public Health*, 90, 553-559.

Compas, B.E., Connor-Smith, J.K., Saltzman, H., Thomsen, A.H., & Wadsworth, M.E. (2001). Coping with stress during childhood and adolescence: Problems, progress, and potential in theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 87-127.
doi:10.1037//0033-2909.127.1.87

Davidson L., & Demaray M.(2007). Social support as a moderator between victimization and internalizing–externalizing distress from bullying. *School Psychology Review*, 36, 383–405.

Dooley, J.J., Grading, P., Strohmeier, D., Cross, D., & Spiel, C. (2010). Cybervictimisation: The association between help-seeking behaviours and self reported emotional symptoms in Australia and Austria. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 20, 194-209. doi: 10.1375/ajgc.20.2.194

Duhue, F., Bolman, C., & Vollink, T. (2008). Cyberbullying: Youngsters' experiences and parental perception. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, 11, 217-223.
doi:10.1089/cpb.2007.0008.

Frydenberg, E., & Lewis, R. (1993). Boys play sport and girls turn to others: Age, gender and ethnicity as determinants of coping. *Journal of Adolescence*, 16, 253-266.
doi:[10.1006/jado.1993.1024](https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.1993.1024)

Frydenberg, E., & Lewis, R. (2000). Teaching coping to adolescents: When and to whom? *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 727-745.
doi:10.3102/00028312037003727

Frydenberg, E. (2008). *Adolescent coping: Advances in theory, research and practice*.

New York, NY: Routledge

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J.W. (2007). Offline consequences of online victimization:

School violence and delinquency. *Journal of School Violence*, 6, 89-112.

doi:10.1300/J202v06n03_06

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2013). Social influences on cyberbullying behaviours

among middle and high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42, 711

722. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9902-4

Hoff, D.L., & Mitchell, S.N. (2009). Cyberbullying: Causes, effects, and remedies.

Journal of Educational Administration, 47, 652-665.

doi:10.1108/09578230910981107

Juvonen, J., & Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending the school grounds? Bullying

experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School Health*, 78, 496-505. doi:

10.1111/j.1746-1561.2008.00335.x.

Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York, NY:

Springer Publishing Company, Inc.

Li, Q. (2006). Cyberbullying in schools: A research of gender differences. *School*

Psychology International, 27, 157-170. doi: 10.1177/0143034306064547

MacDonald, C.D., & Roberts-Pittman, B. (2010). Cyberbullying among college students:

Prevalence and demographic differences. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 9, 2003

2009. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.436

Machmutow, K., Perren, S., Sticca, F., & Alasker, F.D. (2012). Peer victimisation and

depressive symptoms: Can specific coping strategies buffer the negative impact of

cybervictimisation? *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 17, 403-420. doi:

10.1080/13632752.2012.704310

- Mitchell, K. J., Ybarra, M., & Finkelhor, D. (2007). The relative importance of online victimization in understanding depression, delinquency and substance use. *Child Maltreatment, 12*, 314-324. doi:10.1177/1077559507305996
- Parris, L., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., & Cutts, H. (2012). High school students' perceptions of coping with cyberbullying. *Youth and Society, 44*, 284-306. doi:10.1177/0044118X11398881
- Paul, S., Smith, P. K., & Blumberg, H. H. (2012). Revisiting cyberbullying in schools using the quality circle approach. *School Psychology International, 33*, 492-504. doi:10.1177/0143034312445243
- Perren, S., Corcoran, L., Cowie, H., Dehue, F., Garcia, D., McGurkin, C... Vollink, T. (2012). Tackling cyberbullying: Review of empirical evidence regarding successful responses by students, parents, and schools. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 6*, 283-293.
- Price, M., & Dalgleish, J. (2010). Cyberbullying: Experiences, impacts and coping strategies as described by Australian young people. *Youth Studies Australia, 29*, 51-59.
- Richard, J.F., Schneider, B.H., & Mallet, P. (2012). Revisiting the whole school approach to bullying: Really looking at the whole school. *School Psychology International, 33*, 263-284. doi: 10.1177/0143034311415906
- Schenk, A.M., & Fremouw, W.J. (2012). Prevalence, psychological impact, and coping of cyberbullying victims among college students. *Journal of School Violence, 11*, 21-37. doi:10.1080/15388220.2011.630310
- Skinner, E.A., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M.J. (2007). The development of coping. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 119-144. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085705

- Slonje, R., & Smith, P.K. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying?
Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 49, 147-154. doi: 10.1111/j.1467
9450.2007.00611.x.
- Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008).
Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child
Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49, 376-385. doi: 10.1111/j.1469
7610.2007.01846.x.
- Smith, P. K., & Shu, S. (2000). What good schools can do about bullying: Findings
from a survey in English schools after a decade of research and action. *Childhood*, 7,
193-212. doi: 10.1177/0907568200007002005
- Sticca, F., & Perren, S. (2013). Is cyberbullying worse than traditional bullying? Examining
the differential roles of medium, publicity, and anonymity for the perceived severity
of bullying. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42, 739-750. doi: 10.1007/s10964
012-9867-3
- Tenenbaum, L. S., Varjas, K., Meyer, J., & Parris, L. (2011). Coping strategies and
perceived effectiveness in fourth through eighth grade victims of bullying. *School
Psychology International*, 32, 263-287. doi: 10.1177/0143034311402309
- Tokunaga, R.S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of
research on cyberbullying victimisation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 277-287.
doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.014
- Vollink, T., Bolman, C.A.W., Dehue, F., & Jacobs, N.C.L. (2013). Coping with
cyberbullying: Differences between victims, bullying-victims and children not
involved in bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 7-24.
doi: 10.1002/casp.2142

Walker, C.M., Rajan Sockman, B., & Koehn, S. (2011). An exploratory study of cyberbullying with undergraduate university students. *TechTrends*, 55, 31-38.
doi:10.1007/s11528-011-0481-0

Wensley, K., & Campbell, M. (2012). Heterosexual and non-heterosexual young university students' involvement in traditional and cyber forms of bullying. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15, 649-654. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2012.0132

Zimmer-Gembeck, M.J., & Skinner, E.A. (2011). Review: The development of coping across childhood and adolescence: An integrative review and critique of research. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35, 1-17.
doi:10.1177/0165025410384923

Table 1. *Descriptive frequencies of coping strategy intentions for future experiences of cyberbullying*

Coping Item	Mean	SD	Median	IQR
Block	3.36	.753	4.00	1.00
Stay away from where the cyberbullying is taking place	2.89	.782	3.00	1.00
Ask the bully to stop	2.85	.903	3.00	2.00
Help from friends	2.80	.869	3.00	1.00
Ignore	2.56	.855	3.00	1.00
Retaliate	2.47	.837	2.00	1.00
Help from family	2.33	1.02	2.00	2.00
Threaten to report	2.33	.864	2.00	1.00
Help from university counsellor	1.83	.843	2.00	1.00
Help from university lecturer	1.64	.788	1.00	1.00
Others to cyberbully the bully	1.60	.741	4.00	1.00

Note. Item names have been truncated.

Table 2. Mann-Whitney U test results for coping strategy intentions for victims and non-victims

[illegible]

cyberbully to stop	40	2.75 (.870)	3.00 (1.00)	127.91	237	2.88 (.910)	3.00 (2.00)	140.87	-.997
Seek help family	41	2.41 (1.07)	2.00 (1.50)	147.85	241	2.31 (1.02)	2.00 (2.00)	140.42	-.560
Seek help from friends	41	2.78 (1.01)	3.00 (2.00)	140.63	238	2.81 (.845)	3.00 (1.00)	139.89	-.059
Seek help from university counsellor	40	1.90 (.871)	2.00 (2.00)	145.63	239	1.83 (.840)	2.00 (1.00)	139.06	-.510

Note. $**p < 0.01$. Items have been truncated.

Table 3. *Mann-Whitney U test results for coping strategy intentions for females and males*

Coping Item	Females				Males				
	N	M (SD)	Median (IQR)	Rank average	N	M (SD)	Median (IQR)	Rank average	Z
Blocking	204	3.50 (.608)	4.00 (1.00)	151.93	77	3.00 (.960)	3.00 (2.00)	112.05	-4.06**
Others to cyberbully	203	1.50 (.692)	1.00 (1.00)	131.47	77	1.84 (.812)	2.00 (1.00)	164.30	-3.37**
Threaten to report	204	2.43 (.842)	2.00 (1.00)	151.13	78	2.05 (.866)	2.00 (2.00)	116.31	-3.40**
Help from family	204	2.51 (.985)	3.00 (1.00)	155.98	78	1.85 (.968)	2.00 (1.00)	103.64	-5.05**
Help from friends	201	2.89 (.835)	3.00 (1.00)	147.26	78	2.58 (.919)	3.00 (1.00)	121.29	-2.59**
Help from university counsellor	202	1.94 (.861)	2.00 (2.00)	149.25	77	1.57 (.733)	1.00 (1.00)	115.74	-3.32**
Help from university lecturer	203	1.76 (.799)	2.00 (1.00)	152.56	78	1.36 (.683)	1.00 (1.00)	110.90	-4.25**

Retaliate	204	2.47 (.797)	3.00 (1.00)	141.38	77	2.48 (.940)	2.00 (1.00)	139.98	-.138
Stay away	204	2.96 (.735)	3.00 (.75)	146.61	78	2.73 (.878)	3.00 (1.00)	128.13	-1.85
Ignore	203	2.55 (.844)	2.00 (.100)	139.70	78	2.59 (.889)	3.00 (1.00)	144.38	-.460
Ask cyberbully to stop	201	2.88 (.875)	3.00 (2.00)	140.22	76	2.80 (.980)	3.00 (2.00)	135.76	-.436

Note. ** $p < 0.01$. Item names have been truncated.